



**ITDS Product Information Committee
MEETING MINUTES**

Wednesday, March 11, 2009

10:00 AM – 11:00 PM

Location: USDA, Room 3074

A meeting of the ITDS Product Information Committee (PIC) was called to order by the Chairman on March 11, 2009, at approximately 10:05 AM ET in Washington, DC, and by teleconference. The following members were present in the meeting room or identified themselves by an email as being on the phone:

Member	Agency
Douglas Bailey	USDA/AMS, Chair
Max Castillo, Jr.	FDA/ITDS
Michiko Shaw	USDA/AMS
David Giamporcaro	EPA*
Jim Joholske	Consumer Product Safety Commission*
Cornelia Mueller	USDA/APHIS*
Susan Dyszel	DHS*
Janis Kadela	DHS*
Mary Stanley	USDA/FSIS
Mike Kelley	USDA/FSIS*
LuAnn Alspach	DOJ*

* Participated by phone. Additional parties participated by phone but are not identified here, including representatives from Fish and Wildlife, DOT, and ATF.

The issues below were presented and discussed, but not necessarily in the following order.

REVIEW OF CHANGES TO DRAFT 2.1 ----- BAILEY

Mr. Bailey thanked all PGAs for commenting on the draft, and believe that the report was much improved through the efforts of all. Mr. Bailey presented a summary of the general changes made to the document in response to PGA comments, and asked that participants refer to the redline draft and the “clean” revised draft provided by email to all representatives. Mr. Bailey emphasized that all content, including the tables, were still draft and it is still not too late for new content from any PGA.

A number of editorial changes were made to accommodate the range of perspectives provided by the PGAs. One particular sensitivity was that of appearing to endorse particular products. Mr. Bailey agreed that this is an important sensitivity, and that government should never take sides in a competitive product situation. However, when there is no competing product or system, government can and should recognize the value in using existing systems such as the Global Trade Item Number (GTIN). There is no competing system for global product identification, and this system is used almost universally for commercial, consumer oriented products. In the same way, the use of the Global Data Synchronization Network standards, developed by industry and used widely by industry,

have no true competition. These standards were developed by industry for industry use by a non-profit, voluntary standards organization. Recommending that government take advantage of such a system should not be interpreted as anti-competitive. Finally, Mr. Bailey noted that the choice of a GDSN-certified data pool is the one place where we should not and will not recommend a particular provider, as there are competing solutions that could offer this service.

In general, the PGAs noted that the draft report was taking shape nicely and that they were comfortable with the positions expressed and the presentation of the content.

NEXT STEPS FOR COMPLETING REPORT ----- BAILEY

The participants agreed that the remaining sections of the report dealing with financial impacts and the technical data synchronization between the GDSN and ACE should be completed in a high-level, brief manner. Mr. Bailey agreed to draft those sections and distribute them for comment as quickly as possible. A technical meeting between ACE technicians and GS1 would still proceed as a precursor to potential pilot work, although much pilot work can be performed to validate the proposed report concepts without making any modifications to the ACE system. The participants then agree that the goal would be to complete these sections and finish all other report edits by no later than March 31. This would allow final formatting and preparation of the report the first week of April. The final report is to be delivered to the ITDS Board at their April 16 meeting.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS ----- BAILEY

The participants agreed that a review of the draft recommendations and action points would be appropriate for the March ITDS board meeting, and Mr. Bailey agreed to provide that content in a presentation to the Board. The PGAs agreed to provide any final edits and comments no later than March 31, including table content such as the missing definitions for properties in Table 1. Once the final report is released, the PGAs realize that there will need to be follow-on action to explain the report's concepts to CBP, industry, and other PGAs.

Mr. Bailey called for final questions or comments, and hearing none, adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:57 AM.